Board Members

David P. Yandell, Ph.D.
Chair
Maryann Santos de Barona, Ph.D.
Vice-Chair
Michael J. Rohrbaugh, Ph.D.
Secretary
Denise M. Bainton, J.D.
James J. Cox, Ed.D.
Wil R. Counts, Ph.D.
Manuel H. Delgado, Jr., J.D.
Joseph C. Donaldson
Maureen K. Lassen, Ph.D.



State of Arizona Board of Psychologist Examiners

1400 West Washington, Suite 235
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
Phone: 602-542-8162
Fax: 602-542-8279
E-Mail: info@psychboard.az.gov
www.psychboard.az.gov

Staff

Maxine McCarthy
Executive Director

Marcus E. Harvey Projects Specialist

David S. Shapiro Investigator

Shari S. Courtnay Admin. Secretary

REGULAR SESSION MINUTES

APRIL 5-6, 2002

1400 West Washington Basement Conference Room, #B-1 Phoenix, AZ 85007

Friday, April 5, 2002

1. CALL TO ORDER

The regular session of the Arizona State Board of Psychologist Examiners was called to order by Chairperson Yandell at 8:40 a.m. on Friday, April 5, 2002. Executive Session was held from 10:55 a.m. to 11:25 a.m. for the purpose of obtaining confidential legal advice.

2. ROLL CALL

Board Members Present

David P. Yandell, Ph.D. - Chairperson Maryann Santos de Barona, Ph.D. - Vice-Chairperson Michael J. Rohrbaugh, Ph.D. - Secretary Denise M. Bainton, J.D. Wil R. Counts, Ph.D. James J. Cox, Ed.D. Manuel H. Delgado, Jr., J.D. Joseph C. Donaldson

Board Members Absent

Maureen K. Lassen, Ph.D.

Staff Present

Maxine McCarthy, Executive Director Marcus Harvey, Projects Specialist David Shapiro, Investigator Shari Courtnay, Administrative Secretary

Attorney General's Office

Nancy J. Beck, J.D., Assistant Attorney General

Solicitor General's Office

Victoria Mangiapane, J.D., Assistant Attorney General

3. REMARKS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairperson Yandell introduced the Board's two new members, Dr. James Cox and Mr. Manuel Delgado, and welcomed them to the Board. Dr. Yandell then presented Board members awards to Gary Lovejoy, Ph.D. for his service on the Board and noted that Dr. Lovejoy had served as chairperson during the February 1-2, 2002 Board meeting. Dr. Yandell also announced that documentation was available for licensees who wished to receive continuing education credit for attending Board meetings. He stated that anyone was welcome to complete a Board meeting assessment survey.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

• Regular Session – February 1-2, 2002

Dr. Counts stated that the minutes may need to be amended on page 7, Item 17(b)(1), as he did not recall seconding the motion nor supporting that vote. Dr. Rohrbaugh added that he did not support the motion either. Staff indicated that they would listen to the audiotapes and correct the minutes if necessary. Dr. Counts also added that page 8, Item 19 of the minutes should refer to weasel words in the "APA ethics code." A motion was made by Dr. Counts, seconded by Dr. Santos de Barona, and unanimously carried (6-0-2), with Mr. Delgado and Dr. Cox abstaining from the vote, to approve as amended, the February 1-2, 2002 Regular Session minutes.

• Executive Session – February 1-2, 2002

A motion was made by Dr. Counts, seconded by Dr. Santos de Barona, and unanimously carried (6-0-2), with Mr. Delgado and Dr. Cox abstaining from the vote, to approve the February 1-2, 2002 Executive Session minutes.

• Conference Call Regular Session – February 8, 2002

A motion was made by Dr. Santos de Barona, seconded by Dr. Counts, and unanimously carried (6-0-2), with Mr. Delgado and Dr. Cox abstaining from the vote, to approve the February 8, 2002 Conference Call Regular Session minutes.

• Conference Call Executive Session – March 1, 2002

Mr. Donaldson made a motion, seconded by Ms. Bainton, and unanimously carried (6-0-2), with Dr. Santos de Barona and Mr. Delgado abstaining from the vote, to approve the March 1, 2002 Conference Call Regular Session minutes.

5. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Chairperson Yandell gave the public the opportunity to address the Board at this time. Richard Morris, Ph.D., addressed the Board, asking that since the Board was considering possible Rules revisions, that it also consider exempting school psychologists who work in charter schools from licensure since the statute only exempts those working in a common or high school setting.

6. INFORMAL INTERVIEW – COMPLAINT NO. 01-16 – WALTER E. FIDLER, Ph.D. and DISCUSSION/DECISION REGARDING PROPOSED CONSENT AGREEMENT

Dr. Yandell announced that it was the time and place for the Informal Interview and discussion of the proposed consent agreement for Walter E. Fidler, Ph.D. Board members and staff introduced themselves. The Complainant was present and made a statement to the Board after being sworn in by the court reporter, whose transcript shall serve as the official record of the proceedings. Dr. Fidler was present with his attorney, Stephen Myers, J.D., and they introduced themselves. Mr. Myers addressed the Board, explaining the proposed consent agreement. Dr. Fidler then read a letter of apology to the Complainants. Board members proceeded to discuss the proposed consent agreement.

After deliberations, a motion was made by Dr. Yandell, seconded by Dr. Cox, and unanimously carried (7-0-1), with Mr. Delgado abstaining from the vote, to accept the proposed consent agreement, with the modifications of requiring Dr. Fidler to take three graduate semester hours in both ethics and marriage and family therapy, and to reimburse the insurance companies as well. The modified consent agreement was then presented to Dr. Fidler and his attorney, who also requested modifications to give Dr. Fidler one and half years to reimburse the insurance companies, to give him until January 30, 2004 to complete the course work, and to specify that he shall not request modification of the education requirements of the consent agreement before January 30, 2004. The Board discussed the proposed modifications agreed to by Dr. Fidler and his attorney, and a motion was made by Dr. Yandell, seconded by Dr. Cox, and unanimously carried, (7-0-1), with Mr. Delgado abstaining from the vote, to accept the consent agreement, as modified.

7. INFORMAL INTERVIEW – COMPLAINT NOS. 01-37 AND 01-43 – JOHN T. BECK, Ph.D.

Dr. Yandell announced that it was the time and place for the informal interview of John T. Beck, Ph.D. and gave the order of the proceedings, which included discussing each complaint separately, beginning with 01-37. Drs. Cox, Yandell and Counts all stated that they were once Oral Examiners with Dr. Beck, but that they would not be biased.

Nancy Beck, J.D., Assistant Attorney General, stated that she is not to her knowledge related to Dr. Beck. David Shapiro, Board Investigator summarized the complaint. The Complainant was present but did not address the Board. Dr. Beck was present with his attorney, Stephen Myers, J.D., and was sworn in the by the court reporter whose transcript shall serve as the official record of the proceedings. Board members proceeded to question Dr. Beck, after which a motion was made by Dr. Yandell, seconded by Dr. Counts, and unanimously carried (8-0), to move into executive session for the purpose of obtaining confidential legal advice.

Upon return to open session, Board members resumed deliberations on the complaint. After some discussion, Ms. Bainton made a motion which was seconded by Dr. Cox, to postpone Complaint No. 01-37 to clarify the specific issues in the this complaint, and to have the investigator select five to eight random reports of evaluations from Dr. Beck regarding workers' compensation within the past two years. The Board will subpoena all patient records on these people and retain a neuropsychologist consultant to review the cases to identify any deficiencies in Dr. Beck's reports and render an opinion regarding Dr. Beck's use of boilerplate language in his reports. Dr. Rohrbaugh offered an amendment to the motion, seconded by Dr. Santos de Barona, and withdrawn after some discussion, to remove the consultant's report requirement. Board members unanimously voted to approve the original motion (8-0). A motion was then made by Dr. Yandell, seconded by Mr. Donaldson, and carried (7-1), with Mr. Delgado voting no, to reopen RFI 01-06 to allow the Board to consider Dr. Beck's use of boilerplate language in the report generated in that case, notice Dr. Beck, and add it to the informal interview in Case No. 01-37.

The Board then began consideration of Complaint No. 01-43. Mr. Shapiro summarized the complaint for the Board. The Complainant made a statement to the Board after being sworn in by the court reporter, whose transcript shall serve as the official record of the proceedings. Board members questioned Dr. Beck, followed by a closing statement from his attorney, Mr. Myers. Board members then discussed the complaint followed by a motion from Dr. Rohrbaugh, which was seconded by Mr. Donaldson, and unanimously carried (8-0), to dismiss the complaint as there was no violation of the Board's statutes or rules.

8. HEARING ON DENIAL OF LICENSE APPLICATION – SHARON OZER, Ph.D.

Dr. Yandell announced that it was time for the license denial hearing for Sharon Ozer, Ph.D. Dr. Ozer was present with her attorney, H. Leslie Hall, J.D., and they introduced themselves, as did Nancy Beck, J.D., representing the State, and Victoria Mangiapane representing the Solicitor General's Office as counsel for the Board. Board members and staff introduced themselves and Dr. Yandell explained the procedures for the hearing.

Ms. Hall was given the opportunity to make an opening statement but it was agreed by the Chairperson and the State to allow her first witness, Dr. Steven Buckey, Director of training at the California School of Professional Psychology, to testify immediately via telephone as he had a flight to catch momentarily. The witness was sworn in by the court reporter, whose transcript shall serve as the official record of the proceedings. Ms. Hall questioned Dr. Buckey, followed by a cross-examination by Ms. Beck, and additional questions from Ms. Hall. Ms. Hall then made an opening statement.

Ms. Beck took a moment to confer with Ms. Hall and then stated that she had never seen most of the documents presented by Dr. Ozer today nor knew of Dr. Buckey and the substance of his testimony. She explained that Dr. Ozer might be able to prove she meets the licensure requirements, expediting the hearing, if the Board accepted Ms. Hall's premise that "two psychologists on staff as supervisors" meant one at staff at Dr. Ozer's internship site and one on staff at her graduate school. Ms. Beck maintained that the Board would need documentation of this on which to base their licensing decision, however, rather than mere oral testimony. It was agreed to by Ms. Hall, Ms. Beck and the Board to recess the hearing until later in the afternoon to allow Dr. Ozer to obtain the necessary documentation.

After the recess, Ms. Hall presented to the Board a letter from the California School of Professional Psychology to document that Dr. Ozer's training program had two psychologists on staff as supervisors. Ms Hall made a closing statement to the Board and Ms. Beck indicated that she had no further evidence to present regarding deficiencies. Board members then proceeded to deliberate, after which a motion was made by Dr. Counts, seconded by Ms. Bainton, and unanimously carried (8-0), that Dr. Ozer has met the Board's licensure requirements and to grant her a license.

9. HEARING ON DENIAL OF LICENSE APPLICATION – DENNIS THOENNES, Ph.D.

Dr. Yandell announced that it was time for the license denial hearing for Dennis Thoennes, Ph.D. Dr. Thoennes

represented and introduced himself, as did Ms. Beck, representing the State, and Victoria Mangiapane representing the Solicitor General's Office as counsel for the Board. Board members and staff introduced themselves and Dr. Yandell explained the procedures for the hearing. Dr. Thoennes was joined by his witness, Kristen Solberg, Ed.D., and Ms. Beck was joined by her witness, Marcus Harvey, Projects Specialist for the Board. Dr. Thoennes and the witnesses were all sworn in by the court reporter, whose transcript shall serve as the official record of the proceedings.

Dr. Thoennes and Ms. Beck then made their opening statements. Dr. Thoennes called Dr. Solberg and questioned him, after which Dr. Solberg was cross-examined by Ms. Beck. Dr. Thoennes also testified to the Board, and was cross-examined by Ms. Beck. Ms. Beck then called Mr. Harvey, as witness for the State and questioned him followed by cross-examination from Dr. Thoennes. Drs. Thoennes and Solberg answered Board members' questions and Dr. Thoennes made a closing statement, followed by a closing statement from Ms. Beck. Board members then proceeded to deliberate. After some discussion, Ms. Bainton made a motion, seconded by Dr. Cox, and carried (7-1), with Dr. Rohrbaugh voting no, to affirm the denial of licensure.

Saturday, April 6, 2002

10. CALL TO ORDER

The regular session of the Arizona State Board of Psychologist Examiners was called to order by Chairperson Yandell at 8:40 a.m. on Saturday, April 6, 2002. Executive Session was held from 12:00 p.m. to 12:46 p.m. for the purpose of receiving confidential legal advice and to discuss pending or contemplated litigation.

Agenda items 17, 19 and 20 took place on Friday, April 5, 2002. All other items after this point took place on Saturday, April 6, 2002.

11. ROLL CALL

Board Members Present

David P. Yandell, Ph.D. - Chairperson
Maryann Santos de Barona, Ph.D. - Vice-Chairperson
Michael J. Rohrbaugh, Ph.D. - Secretary
Denise M. Bainton, J.D.
Wil R. Counts, Ph.D.
James J. Cox, Ed.D.
Manuel H. Delgado, Jr., J.D.
Joseph C. Donaldson

Staff Present

Maxine McCarthy, Executive Director Marcus Harvey, Projects Specialist David Shapiro, Investigator Shari Courtnay, Administrative Secretary

Attorney General's Office

Nancy J. Beck, J.D., Assistant Attorney General

Board Members Absent

Maureen K. Lassen, Ph.D.

12. DISCUSSION/DECISION REGARDING INITIAL REVIEW OF REQUESTS FOR INVESTIGATION (RFI)

RFI 02-02 David S. Prince, Psy.D.

Ms. Bainton stated that while she had met the Complainant once, she did not know her personally and knew nothing in advance of the complaint and could remain unbiased. Dr. Cox disclosed that he had met with Dr. Prince once, but that he has had no further dealing with him and could remain unbiased. Dr. Prince was present and made a statement to the Board. The Complainant was not present and Board members discussed the case and instructed the investigator to gather more information. Dr. Counts made a motion, which died for lack of a second, to issue a letter of concern to Dr. Prince in that he blurred his roles as an advocate and a psychologist. A motion was then made by Dr. Counts, seconded by Dr. Rohrbaugh, and unanimously carried (8-0), to continue the RFI to allow the investigator to obtain records and more information.

RFI 02-03 Daniel J. Gaughan, Ph.D.

Mr. Shapiro summarized the allegations for the Board. No one was present to speak and Board members discussed the case. A motion was made by Dr. Santos de Barona, seconded by Dr. Rohrbaugh, and unanimously carried (8-0), to dismiss the complaint as there was no violation of the Board's statutes or rules.

RFI 02-04 Christopher J. Nicholls, Ph.D.

Drs. Cox and Yandell both stated that they were once Oral Examiners with Dr. Nicholls, but that they would not be biased. Mr. Shapiro summarized the allegations for the Board and gave additional information regarding his attempts to interview the Complainant. No one was present to speak and Board members discussed the case. A motion was made by Mr. Donaldson, seconded by Dr. Santos de Barona, and carried (6-1-1), with Dr. Cox voting no and Dr. Rohrbaugh abstaining from the vote, to dismiss the complaint as there was no violation of the Board's statutes or rules.

RFI 02-05 Clayton L. Boyer, Ed.D.

The Complainant was present and made a statement to the Board. Mr. Shapiro then summarized the allegations and Board proceeded to discuss the case. A motion was made by Dr. Cox, seconded by Dr. Counts, and unanimously carried (8-0), to invite Dr. Boyer to an informal interview to with the Board to address allegations:

- that he engaged in a sexual relationship with a former client, which may have resulted in harm to the client or others:
- that he betrayed professional confidences; and
- that he did not retain the client records of P.E.

These allegations, if true, could constitute a violation of A.R.S. §§ 2061 through 32-2086 and A.A.C. R4-26-101 through R4-26-308, including, but not limited to A.R.S. §§ 32-2061(A)(13):

- (b) Betraying professional confidences;
- (h) Failing or refusing to maintain and retain adequate business, financial or professional records pertaining to the psychological services provided to a client; and
- (o) ...engaging in activities as a psychologist that are unprofessional by current standards of practice, illustrated by
 - APA Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct, Standard 4.07.

RFI 02-06 John A. Moran, Ph.D.

Mr. Shapiro summarized the allegations for the Board. Dr. Moran was present but did not address the Board. The Complainant was not present and the Board proceeded to deliberate. After discussion, a motion was made by Dr. Santos de Barona, seconded by Dr. Rohrbaugh, and unanimously carried (8-0), to dismiss the complaint as there was no violation of the Board's statutes or rules.

RFI 02-07 Warren R. Littleford, Ph.D.

Dr. Yandell recused himself from this proceeding due to an ongoing personal and professional relationship with Dr. Littleford. Maxine McCarthy, Executive Director, stated that Mr. Shapiro was unable to investigate the complaint as he was personally acquainted with Dr. Littleford. She stated that she had reviewed the complaint and contacted the parties. She then summarized the complaint for the Board. No one was present to address the Board, and Board members proceeded to deliberate. After some discussion, a motion was made by Dr. Counts, seconded by Mr. Donaldson, and unanimously carried (7-0-1), to dismiss the complaint as there was no violation of the Board's statutes or rules.

RFI 02-08 Lidia Artiola, Ph.D.

Dr. Rohrbaugh stated that he had a prior professional relationship with the licensee but that he could remain unbiased. Mr. Shapiro summarized the allegations. No one was present to speak and Board members discussed the complaint. Dr. Counts made a motion, seconded by Dr. Santos de Barona, and unanimously carried (8-0), to dismiss the complaint as there was no violation of the Board's statutes or rules.

The following complaints were reported as ongoing:

RFI 02-09 Julio F. Angulo, Ph.D. RFI 02-10 Daniel J. Gaughan, Ph.D.

13. INFORMAL INTERVIEW- Complaint No. 01-33 - Fred Wiggins, Ph.D.

This matter was postponed to the June Board meeting at the request of Dr. Wiggin's attorney.

14. INFORMAL INTERVIEW- Complaint No. 01-46 - William M. Harnell, Ph.D.

This matter was postponed to the June Board meeting at the request of Dr. Harnell's attorney.

15. DISCUSSION/DECISION REGARDING POSSIBLE RULE REVISIONS

The Board discussed various changes to its Rules that have been proposed in the past few years by current and former Board members, Staff, the Governor's Regulatory Review Council, the Arizona Psychological Association (AzPA) and members of the public. The Board considered the following ideas and voted whether to accept or reject each:

Accepted

- Include date of birth in the definition of "Confidential record"
- Revise semester/trimester/quarter hour conversions under the definition of "Three or more graduate semester hours"
- Revise application filing deadline due to computerized EPPP
- Add new section to implement applications by endorsement and revise procedures
- Repeal "Appendix A" table of prior Arizona EPPP pass points
- Allow Category II continuing education (CE) for activities not psychological in nature, but for professional growth and development as a psychologist or enhancement of psychological practice, education and administration
- Require 3 to 4 continuing education hours in the area of ethics

Rejected

- Define "Multiple relationship"
- Specify that the "National examination" is the EPPP
- Require psychologists to have a written plan for disposition of client records upon retirement or death
- Remove requirement that applicants notarize application
- Allow CE for attendance at an AzPA Governing Council meeting
- Omit references to temporary licenses and additional exams until the Board actually starts giving another exam

It was the consensus of the Board to defer discussion of Dr. Richard Morris' suggestion regarding charter schools (see "Call to the Public", agenda item no. 5) until possible statute changes are discussed.

16. DISCUSSION/DECISION REGARDING CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED FROM JAMES R. YOUNGJOHN, Ph.D. DATED MARCH 18, 2002

Dr. Cox recused himself from this proceeding due to prior contact with Dr. Youngjohn. Board members discussed the correspondence received from Dr. Youngjohn, after which a motion was made by Dr. Rohrbaugh, seconded by Dr. Counts, and unanimously carried (7-0-1), to take no action.

17. DISCUSSION/DECISION REGARDING ENDORSEMENT APPLICATION PROCEDURES – Friday, April 5, 2002

Mr. Harvey explained to the Board that passage of the Board's new legislation allowing for licensure by endorsment requires that new procedures be adopted to handle these types of applications on an expedited basis. This would avoid duplication of effort, unnecessary delay, and accomplish the Board's intentions in accepting credentials for licensure. He proposed that the Board allow Staff to issue endorsement applicants their licenses once their applications are administratively complete, since such applications would only require that the Board receive a few documents to qualify for licensure. Such applications would not have to be substantively reviewed by the Applications Review Committee, unless there was a problem with the application, as such a review would have already been conducted by the organization that issued the credential. At the Board's next meeting, it could then vote to ratify those applicants Staff has previously licensed by endorsement.

After some discussion, a motion was made by Dr. Counts, seconded by Dr. Rohrbaugh, and unanimously carried (8-0), to accept the endorsement applications procedures described by Mr. Harvey.

18. COUNSEL REPORTS AND POSSIBLE BOARD ACTION OF ONGOING COURT CASES

Dr. Cox recused himself from this proceeding due to his knowing several of the parties in this case, and having discussed it with some of them prior to his appointment to the Board.

- Allender v. Board CV2001-008193 Ms. Beck reported that the Superior Court had entered its judgment
 upholding the Board's finding of moral turpitude, and that Dr. Allender had 30 days to appeal the decision to
 the Court of Appeals.
- McDonald v. Board CV2001-329 Ms. Beck reported that the Superior Court of Coconino County issued a minute entry vacating the Board's order. Dr. Yandell made a motion, seconded by Ms. Bainton, and unanimously carried (7-0-1), to move into Executive Session for the purposes of receiving confidential legal advice and to discuss pending or contemplated litigation.

Upon return to open session, Ms. Bainton made a motion, seconded by Dr. Rohrbaugh, and carried (6-0-2), with Mr. Delgado abstaining from the vote, to authorize the Board's attorney to appeal the McDonald v. Board case to the Court of Appeals.

19. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT – Friday, April 5, 2002

- <u>Financial</u> Ms. McCarthy reported that for the month ending February 28, 2002, with four months until the end of the fiscal year, the Board had expended 50% of its appropriation. The budget deficits and shortfall amounts in the State's General fund do not directly affect the Board, she explained, as the Board does not receive any funds from the State coffers. As a self-funded 90-10 agency, Ms. McCarthy stated, the Board actually contributes 10% of its revenues to the State General fund. To date, she reported, the Board had collected approximately \$28,000 in revenue, \$2,800 of which goes to the General fund.
- Newsletter Draft Ms. McCarthy called the Board's attention to the Newsletter draft, and thanked Mr. Harvey for his work on putting it together. She solicited any additional ideas, articles, corrections or comments for it from the Board members.

20. LICENSING REPORT – Friday, April 5, 2002

• New Licenses Issued – Mr. Harvey reported that the Board has licensed the following seven psychologists since the February meeting:

3487	Paul A. Meyer, Psy.D.
3488	Nancy A. Harris, Psy.D.
3489	Kara M. Hendry, Psy.D.
3490	William W. Arnett, Jr., Psy.D.
3491	Nichole R. Nicholls, Ph.D.
3492	Camille A. Garza, Ph.D.
3493	Barbara Forester, Ph.D.

Mr. Harvey reported that that the Board has issued 13 new licenses so far this year, keeping pace with the 13 new licenses issued at this time in 2001.

• <u>EPPP Results</u> – Mr. Harvey reported that the following three applicants passed the EPPP in January and February, while the other two failed:

<u>Pass</u>	<u>raii</u>
Camille A. Garza, Ph.D. Kara M. Hendry, Psy.D.	Emily B. Cabezudo, Ph.D. John E. Walsh, Psy.D.
Nicole R. Nicholls, Ph.D.	·

• <u>New Applications</u> – Finally, Mr. Harvey reported that the Board had received 17 new applications this year, compared to 26 received by this time last year.

21. COMMITTEE REPORTS

LEGISLATIVE/RULES COMMITTEE

- a) <u>Update Regarding Board of Psychologist Examiners Legislation</u> Ms. McCarthy informed the Board that its bill, House Bill 2020, "board of psychologist examiners; reciprocity.", passed the House of Representatives and was on the Consent Calendar in the Senate. She stated that it should go to the Third Read Calendar next week and if passed would go to the Governor for signature.
- b) <u>Update Regarding Board of Behavioral Health Examiners Legislation</u> Mr. Harvey reported that the Board of Behavioral Health Examiners' Senate Bill 1156, "behavioral health; board; definitions" passed and was signed by the Governor on March 21st. It will extend the use of the term psychotherapy to certified counselors, marriage and family therapists and substance abuse counselors.

APPLICATIONS REVIEW COMMITTEE

- Requests to Sit for the EPPP A motion was made by Dr. Santos de Barona, seconded by Dr. Cox, and unanimously carried (8-0), that the following applicants, having met the requirements of A.R.S. §32-2071 and Arizona Administrative Code R4-26-203, be approved to sit for the Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology, and that they be approved for licensure upon receipt of a passing score on the Examination, and payment of the pro-rated original license fee:
 - Sabrina Hitt, Ph.D.
 - Kenneth Littlefield, Psy.D.
- Requests for Licensure (Waiver of EPPP) Dr. Santos de Barona then made a motion, seconded by Dr. Cox, and unanimously carried (8-0), that the following applicant, having met the requirements of A.R.S. § 32-2071.01, be approved for licensure upon payment of the pro-rated original license fee:
 - Edward Gold, Psy.D.

The following applications remained ongoing:

- Toni Brucato, Psy.D.
- Barbara Forester, Ph.D.
- Kathleen Fleming, Ph.D.
- Jeanne King, Ph.D.
- Dave Hennerman, Ph.D.
- Brita Martiny, Ph.D.

- Lisa Peppers, Psy.D.
- Joseph Ricci, Ph.D.
- Shelley Ruelas, Ph.D.
- Icinda Siqueira, Ph.D.
- Timothy Tays, Ph.D.

22. REPORT ON ASPPB MEETING IN ORLANDO, FLORIDA

Dr. Counts reported that it has been found that several licensees nationwide lack knowledge of the psychology statutes and rules, and proposed that the Board consider implementing a state take-home jurisprudence exam, as it was reported at the ASPPB meeting that other states have done, to count for CE credit. He agreed to work with Mr. Harvey on creating such an exam to be potentially put on the Board's website.

Dr. Counts also reported that other states were dealing with the issues of master's-level people pushing to become clinical psychologists and do independent psychological testing. He further reported that the ASPPB was having some problems with computer-based testing in that candidates were not testing in a timely fashion, and that this was causing budget shortfalls for ASPPB.

Mr. Harvey informed the Board that he had suggested to ASPPB that the Professional Examination Service should give candidates a deadline by which to return their applications to test to breakup the backlog which was being caused by applicants delaying to test. Mr. Harvey reported that most states gave a state exam, and that more were moving away from oral exams, to computerized state exams. He also added that he had spoken to representatives from various states to gather information about their implementation of the Certificate of Professional Qualification in Psychology (CPQ). He stated that he was most helped by talking to the Executive Director of the California Board, who informed him of how California licensed applicants with the CPQ and all others, which Mr. Harvey explained served as a basis for adopting new procedures for endorsement applications. Finally, he thanked the Board for giving him the opportunity to go to the meeting.

Dr. Counts also addressed the ASPBB's attempts to achieve standardization in disciplinary nomenclature. Board members asked questions of Dr. Counts and Mr. Harvey and discussed some of the topics.

23. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Board, a motion was made by Dr. Rohrbaugh, seconded by Dr. Santos de Barona, and unanimously carried (8-0), to adjourn the meeting at 2:34 p.m.

Prepared by: Respectfully submitted,

Marcus Harvey /s/ Michael J. Rohrbaugh, Ph.D.

Projects Specialist Board Secretary